

CARELLA, BYRNE, BAIN, GILFILLAN
CECCHI, STEWART & OLSTEIN

OPERATOR: Janice S

5 Becker Farm Road
Roseland, New Jersey 07068

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

TIME COMPLETED: _____

(973) 994-1700

APR 22 2008

EXT. NO.: 524

(973) 994-1744 (FAX)

DATE: April 22, 2008OUR FILE NO.: 411000-138

NAME

FIRM:

FAX NO.

Swapneel Chhaya

U.S. PTO

1-571-270-2434

FROM: William SquireTotal Pages Including Transmittal Sheet: 3

COMMENTS: _____

IF YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSMISSION, OR DO NOT RECEIVE THE NUMBER OF PAGES NOTED, PLEASE CONTACT THE FAX OPERATOR AT (973) 994-1700 (EXT. 211)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: The documents accompanying this telecopy transmission contain information from the law firm of Carella, Byrne, Bain, Gilfillan, Cecchi, Stewart & Olstein, which is confidential and/or legally privileged. The information contained in this facsimile is intended only for the use of the individual named above and others who have been specifically authorized to receive it. If the one receiving it is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this telecopy in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange for the return of the original documents to us at once. Thank you.

The original of this document will be sent by:

☐
☐

Ordinary Mail
Messenger

☐
☐

Overnight Mail
This will be the only form of
delivery of this Document

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**APR 22 2008****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Walter Fix et al.

Serial No.: 10/541,957 Filed: Feb. 2, 2006

Title: ORGANIC FIELD EFFECT TRANSISTOR AND INTEGRATED CIRCUIT

Examiner: Swapneel Chhaya Art Unit: 2822

Atty. Dkt: 411000-138 Customer No. 27162

PROPOSED AMENDED CLAIM 1 UNDER 37 CFR 1.116VIA FAX 571 270 2434
Commissioner for Patents
Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is in view of an examiner's telephone interview with the undersigned on April 22, 2008 and who proposed the below amended claim 1 that is believed to overcome the cited reference rejection over Hart as discussed in the interview. Hart does not show or suggest the limited overlap or the problem overcome as claimed, calling for:

wherein the second electrode layer completely overlies the current channel and overlies a portion of the source or drain electrodes of the first electrode layer, the overlying portion with respect to the source or drain electrodes having a width solely in the range from about 0 to about 20 μm

Hart does not recognize that limiting the overlap as claimed will minimize parasitic capacitance as claimed. Hart's overlap is many orders of magnitude greater. See applicants' spec. page 4, lines 15-26, discussing this. Hart does not recognize the problem with parasitic capacitance or its cause. One of ordinary skill is given no direction or hint by Hart of this problem or the claimed solution. The parasitic capacitance term is a whereby clause that results from the claimed structure and thus is